

Remarks:

This amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay.

It is respectfully noted that, although this case was filed 24 January 2006, the 371 date listed in the file is 12 February 2007, when it was completed. Correction is requested.

The specification has been amended to eliminate some minor obvious errors. No new matter whatsoever has been added.

The Abstract has been replaced with a shorter one complying with US practice.

All of the claims have been amended to place them in better US form.

In addition claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the "sensitive" ceramic layer is actually "chemical-sensitive" and adapted to change electrical properties when contacted by predetermined chemicals. This makes it clearer that the structure claimed is truly a chemical sensor.

The main reference cited against this case, US 5,563,102 of Keith relates to an integrated circuit. The ceramic layers used there serve purely to protect and shield the circuit elements. Ignoring the fact that this reference is nonanalogous art, in that it is not related to a sensor, much less a chemical sensor, none of the embodiments shown in Keith related in structure or function to a chemical sensor having a sensitive ceramic layer.

The basic problem faced by the instant invention, namely making the sensitive ceramic layer stay in place on the other parts of a chemical sensor, are not present with an integrated circuit.

The main differences between the structure of this invention and those of Keith are that:

1. Keith is not a chemical sensor and could not function as one.
2. There is no sensitive ceramic layer here, instead there is a durable synthetic layer used as a shield.
3. In the system of Keith there is nothing resembling the claimed contact holes of claim 1.
4. There is no bond-promoting layer in Keith.

All Keith shows is a ceramic layer on an integrated circuit. Despite the examiner's repeated reference to a "sensor" in Keith, the word "sensor" is not used a single time in this reference. This is nonanalogous art. There is nothing resembling the layers clearly defined in claim 1 in Keith. Thus the rejection on Keith is incorrect and must be withdrawn.

For these reasons the claims are all clearly in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If only minor problems that could be corrected by means of a telephone conference stand in the way of allowance of this case, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned to make the necessary corrections.

K.F. Ross P.C.

By: Andrew Wilford, 26,597
Attorney for Applicant

19 June 2008
5683 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: 718 884-6600
Fax: 718 601-1099
Email: email@kfrpc.com

Enclosure: Marked Specification
 Clean Specification
 Substitute Abstract
 PTO-1449